

Group Memory
CTPAC
Sacramento, Ca.
5900 Folsom Blvd
January 29, 2007

Next Meeting dates

April 25, 2006 in San Bernardino

Bin List & Great Ideas

Group Decisions

All decisions made will be double underlined in the body of the notes below.

1. (Date)

Document Register

1

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike through~~, but left on the list until the next meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

From July, 2005 meeting

80	Mike V	Suggest changes to the extra legal load permit policy guidelines discussed at the July meeting. Send to James	8/15/05 April 27 2005 July 26, 2006
---------------	-------------------	--	--

From January 26, 2006

95	Vaughn	Develop a work group. contact James and set up work group conference call before the September 29 meeting so we can have a work group meeting in conjunction with the Sept 29th meeting. mid February. Variance work group needs to meet with James (see discussion notes outline # 12)	2/15/06 July 26, 2006 Sept 29, 06
---------------	-------------------	---	--

From April 2006 meeting

99	James Bob H	Work with Anthony. Annuals – the Proposal and List should be responded to by June 6. (see discussion notes outline # 4)	6/6/06 8/28/06 3/30/07
102	James	Caltrans will be convening a meeting to discuss the what-ifs, with industry, related to TPMS roll-out; probably in mid-September. Develop the game plan on how to roll it out. (see discussion notes outline # 12)	09/01/06 August 1 2007
103	Aaron James	Follow up on Aaron's item: Revised Manual posted on the web site with the agreed- to TPPM's. (see discussion notes outline # 9.3)	July 26, 06 8/28/06 2/15/07

From July 2006 meeting

104	Eric S	Convene meeting with CT to discuss the closure information quality issue. (see discussion notes outline # 8)	8/28/06 2/15/07
105	Eric	Update the work group rosters. (see discussion notes outline # 3)	8/5/06
106	James	Follow up on Caltrans participation with CT PAC (see discussion notes outline # 3)	8/15/06
107	Aaron	Draft Policy sent out to Eric S to send out for review, on weight transfer methodology. (see discussion notes outline # 9)	Aug 28, 2006
108	Eric and Mike V	identify industry concerns about not having parallel system during implementation, and send the information to Caltrans, so Caltrans will be able to respond at the September meeting (see upshot # 102) and (see discussion notes outline # 14.7)	Aug 15, 2006 2/15/07

From September 2006 meeting

109	Bob S	Send a request to James on making the manual changes easier to see, and compare to the old text of the manuals as changes are made. (see discussion notes outline # 9.3)	
110	James Anderson	Clarify CT PAC role relating to manual – they are to clarify and incorporate policy, not write new policy. (see discussion notes outline # 9.3)	

From September 2006 meeting

111	Kien L	Check further into the lane closure system information quality issue. We need a phone number to call if there is any erroneous information. (see discussion notes outline # 2)	Next meeting.
112	Anthony	Bring Nevada's and Arizona's concerns to the Dual Lane Loading work group. (see discussion notes outline # 5)	Before next meeting.
113	Vaughn	get information back to Caltrans on Tridem issues (see discussion notes outline # 6)	3/30/07
114	James	Make someone from CT available for the fixed loads work group.	2/15/07
115	Greg	Take up the issue of Caltrans deleting requirement for "Dynamic testing of uncommon suspension systems" with the fixed load work group.	3/30/07
116	Work Group leaders	Send your work group memberships to Kien Le for updating the rosters.	2/15/07
117	Anthony	Take the Trunion/Tridem issue to WASHTO in San Diego. Send information to Eric for distribution.	4/xx/07

Critique from July 26, 2006 meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
CHP both divisions here. Lunch Good dialog On time.	FHWA to the meeting? More participation from CT in work groups and in this meeting.

Critique from January 29, 2007. meeting: None done.

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Lunch Meeting room.	Attendance Went overtime. Too much discussion that should happen in the work groups.

Caltrans Transportation Permits Advisory Council (CT PAC)

Purpose:

The purpose of the Caltrans Transporter Permit Advisory Council (CTPAC) is to provide a forum for government and industry viewpoints on State transportation permitting policies and procedures. Both

Caltrans and industry believe that this is an effective way of understanding and improving the permit process. CTPAC representatives use council and steering committee meetings to update their members on changes and help resolve permit related issues.

1. Ground rules:
 1. 1. Begin and end on time
 1. 2. No side conversation
 1. 3. Pagers and cell phones to stun.
 1. 4. Raise your hand when you want to talk;
 1. 5. Speak up; silence is consent.

2. Closure information quality issue
 2. 1. Issue: How is closure information put into the system?
 2. 2. Information comes from the Lane Closure System. Three times a week the information is pulled.
 2. 3. Faxes from Construction engineers on closures is included.
 2. 4. Traffic Management Centers provide weekly updates.
 2. 5. Some information is verbal – emergencies, etc. Most of the information comes from the Lane Closure System.
 2. 6. Phone calls are made to people requesting closures.
 2. 7. Fifteen days lead time required for anything that restricts width or height. Having this written into the contracts is helpful for us.
 2. 8. Information that is put into the system is limited by constraints – 200 characters.
 2. 9. When inaccurate information is on the system, and it is an obvious error, who can we call? We need a way to ensure the information is good quality. Internally the people do a good job getting the information posted, but the information they are given is sometimes poor in quality.
 2. 10. The information needs to be clearly understandable to the truck drivers.
 2. 11. Outcome:
 2. 11. 1. Kien Le will look into the closure information quality issue further. (see discussion notes outline # 111).

3. Dual Lane Loading implementation – Vaughn Goodfellow.
 3. 1. Issue: Narrow dollies are not used very often any more. There is still some work to be done – We need to revisit the issue.
 3. 2. New policy is not advantageous when you are 14 feet wide. You get less weight at 14 feet, but you get more when you go over 15 feet. Now at 17 feet, you can get 1.7 times. This will encourage intermediate width vehicles.
 3. 3. The policy was not interpreted properly in the past.

3. 4. The new policy is proper and has been signed off. No major changes are expected.

3. 5. Outcome:

3. 5. 1. Anthony wants to be consistent with Nevada. He will develop a proposed change for the work group to look at. (see upshot # 112)

4. Crane Group /Mike Vlaming

4. 1. Crane Group has received information from Caltrans and will respond to them on it.

4. 2. What Caltrans has agreed to in terms of load transfer is not in TPMS.

4. 3. When TPMS is implemented, enhancements will be released every three months. This would be a minimum amount of time that could be expected to see the changes coded into TPMS.

4. 4. Permits are now available on an exception basis.

4. 5. Next steps

4. 5. 1. Crane group will review the material sent by Caltrans and respond. They will agree or comment. After the work group has agreed to the proposed language a draft TPPM will be issued within 60 days. Time for the draft TPPM could be as short as three weeks.

5. Annuals / Matt Klenske

5. 1. Annuals: Original proposal is being held up because of concerns informally expressed by the Caltrans Budget Division / Department of Finance. Issue is how this will affect revenue.

5. 2. 7,8 &9 axle – Should hear back in the next 60 days. Probably will be TPMS issue for implementation. Never the less, we will get the department's opinion on this.

5. 3. Next steps:

5. 3. 1. We are waiting for the Caltrans response.

6. Tridem / Vaughn Goodfellow, Doug Murray

6. 1. Discussion: Implementation with regard of equal distribution of the weight for internal Tridem of 25 feet or less.

6. 2. Caltrans question is, " Does this add confusion?"

6. 3. Next steps:

6. 3. 1. Caltrans will be getting input from Arizona and Nevada.

6. 3. 2. Vaughn will get information back to Caltrans on proposals. (see upshot # 113)

7. Variance/ Vaughn Goodfellow

7. 1. Proposal: Industry will propose a new addendum on the initial proposal that has been on hold for more than 2 years. Will be looking for 17 feet on yellow routes, 16 feet on green routes; 18 feet on yellow routes that are three or more lanes in a direction, and an unlimited width at grade or over or under crossings of state routes without CHP escort. We hope to get more input from CHP.

7. 2. Because of staffing, industry does not want to have mundane, routine width variance loads accompanied by permit writers staff due to time frame and staffing constraints.
7. 3. Caltrans wants additional time to process permits for any permits for loads that weigh more than 425,000 pounds (not gross). Inspections needed before and after the loads would be in order.
7. 4. Next steps
 7. 4. 1. Industry will work on a reasonable proposal for their addendum.
8. Fixed Loads WG / Greg Dineen
 8. 1. We will bring back fixed load inspections for legal width.
 8. 2. Next steps:
 8. 2. 1. Industry will appeal the inspection of fixed load that is not over weight or height.
 8. 2. 2. Caltrans needs to assign someone to work with the work group. James will make an assignment for this. (see upshot #
9. Status of Development of Transportation Permits Manual – Chapter 3 / Bob Shepard
 9. 1. We met and conferred. Suggested changes have been sent to Caltrans.
 9. 2. With regard to five of the old TPPM's, there are a couple of requests for things to be assigned to work groups:
 9. 2. 1. Exceeding tire capacity -
 9. 2. 2. Reviewing over-length semi trailers.
 9. 2. 3. HOV lanes – Chapter 5 and 9
 9. 3. Chapter 4 – should be updated.
 9. 4. Chapter 7 – Abdel in North Region is working on revisions. There are no changes to the compliance program.
 9. 5. Caltrans updated the manual with the 4-5 TPPMs that were questionable to industry.
 9. 6. Next steps
 9. 6. 1. Industry will review and send in comments on Chapter 7.
 9. 6. 2. Industry will comment on the TPPM's that were incorporated into the manual.
10. TPMS update:
 10. 1. Testing cycle ends Feb 2.
 10. 2. Intent is to have a pilot by August 2007.
11. Discussion: Caltrans deleting requirement for "Dynamic testing of uncommon suspension systems"
 11. 1. Issue: Should this topic be assigned to a workgroup for further exploration

- 11. 2. There are not laboratories nor equipment for dynamic testing. Currently inspectors are using +/- 10%.
- 11. 3. Next steps: Outcome
 - 11. 3. 1. This issue will go to Fixed Loads work group for work. (see upshot # 115)